## IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA ATLANTA DIVISION

LESLIE ADGAR,

Movant,

v.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA.

Respondent.

MOTION TO VACATE 28 U.S.C. § 2255

CRIMINAL ACTION NO. 1:08-cr-49-TCB-RGV-1

CIVIL ACTION FILE NUMBER 1:16-cv-2702-TCB

## ORDER

This case comes before the Court on Magistrate Judge Russell G. Vineyard's Final Report and Recommendation (the "R&R") [95], which recommends dismissing Movant Leslie Adgar's pro se motion to vacate [94]—the second such motion filed in this Court, see [81]—as impermissibly second or successive. No objections to the R&R have been filed.

The Court has conducted a "careful and complete" review of the R&R for clear error. *Williams v. Wainwright*, 681 F.2d 732, 732 (11th Cir. 1982) (per curiam); *Macort v. Prem, Inc.*, 208 F. App'x 781, 784

(11th Cir. 2006). Having done so, it finds no error in Judge Vineyard's factual findings or legal conclusions. Because Adgar's § 2255 motion is successive and the record contains no indication that Adgar obtained the necessary authorization from the Eleventh Circuit to file it, this Court lacks jurisdiction to consider it. See 28 U.S.C. §§ 2254(b)(3)(A) & 2255(h).

The Court therefore adopts as its Order the R&R [95], dismisses Adgar's § 2255 motion [94], and declines to issue a certificate of appealability.

IT IS SO ORDERED this 4th day of October, 2016.

Timothy C. Batten, Sr.

United States District Judge

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> *Macort* addressed only the standard of review applied to a magistrate judge's factual findings, but the Supreme Court has held that there is no reason for a district court to apply a different standard of review to a magistrate judge's legal conclusions. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 150 (1985). Thus, district courts in this circuit have routinely applied a clear-error standard to both. *See Tauber v. Barnhart*, 438 F. Supp. 2d 1366, 1373-74 (N.D. Ga. 2006) (collecting cases).